

February 20, 1967

Approved For Release 2004/04/08 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500010044-1

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H1531

tive, or an associate which touch directly upon governmental—Federal, State, or local—financial transactions. In keeping with the recognition that these relationships are not necessarily unethical and indeed might be correct and beneficial to everyone, including the public, such financial relationships are not prohibited. On the other hand, this gray area can—and perhaps does—cover many activities which have the same net result as those specifically prohibited by ethic 2; therefore, all transactions in this gray area are required to be reported under the procedure set forth in ethic 7. A specific example of a transaction coming within this ethic would be the retaining of a Member's law firm to represent a municipality or other entity of local government in negotiating a contract with a Federal agency.

**Rights:** Right 1 is a somewhat expanded statement of the principle behind the language in article 1, section 6 of the Constitution stating that—

For any Speech or Debate in either House, they [the Senators and Representatives] shall not be questioned in any other place.

Clearly the constitutional language does not contain explicit wording protecting a Member from being brought to task for his political views; yet this security is the clearly implied corollary of the constitutional provision. In other words, the ethic is written to prevent disciplinary action being taken against a Member for holding, expressing, or voting views that other Members may feel to be supportive of political or religious differences. Moreover, as the Supreme Court has recently pointed out in the Bond case (*Julian Bond v. "Sloppy" Floyd*, decided October term, 1966), the first amendment's protection of citizens' free speech certainly applies to the Members of the National Legislature—as well as to State legislators, as was the case in *Bond*. The speech exception allows for the free operation of the precedents in Jefferson's manual and the House rules dealing with such matters as proper address, impugning of motives, non-reference to personalities, and appropriate speech in regard to the Senate or Senators.

Right 2 establishes that the personal morality of a Member is basically a matter that his constituents pass upon and not the House, unless the morality of a Member becomes such as to actually effect the order, dignity, or decorum of the House itself. Neither the fact that other Members did not approve of a Member's conduct, his moral views, or moral code, nor the fact that Members object to having one or more colleagues whose moral views and conduct provide a somewhat wider diversity than is the present public concept of the National Legislature, are valid grounds for any action against such a Member. Indeed, this approach was essentially that of the Constitution: Qualifications for Members of the House were specifically set by article 1, section 2, clause 2:

No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty-five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Madison and other members of the Constitutional Convention stated emphatically first, that the specified three qualifications were to be the only one; second, that the reason for this was that disagreement with the political or moral views of a Member by his colleagues should not entitle them to refuse to accept that Member into the House, and third, that such a power would be a dangerous one. They also decisively defeated attempts in the Constitutional Convention either to allow the Congress to add additional qualifications or to directly specify such qualifications—for example, property ownership.

Right 3 in effect specifies that the fifth amendment's guarantee of procedural due process of law shall obtain in any process or action taken against a Member by any committee or other agent of the House.

Right 4 states that—provided first such activity is consistent with the Member's duty to his constituents and to his colleagues—the Member retains the right to continue to pursue his usual business, trade, or profession. It should be noted that this, too, is in keeping with the concept of a national legislature composed of men of viable roots in the economic as well as the social soil of their nation.

#### THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY AND ITS PROGRAM OF SUBSIDIZING STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the country is shocked and deeply disturbed by the recent disclosure that the Central Intelligence Agency has been subsidizing student organizations. We have every reason to be disturbed. These covert relationships corrode the very foundation of a free society. I commend the President for directing his administration to find ways of insuring that these secret relationships between the Central Intelligence Agency and the academic world are broken, and stay broken.

Mr. Katzenbach, the Under Secretary of State, has told the press that the President has directed the State Department to explore ways by which U.S. student organizations will be able to play an active role in international student activities without resorting to subsidies from the Central Intelligence Agency. I would like to remind Mr. Katzenbach and my colleagues that the Department of State needs no additional authority to provide open, untainted aid to students, scholars, or scientists wishing to attend international conferences. The Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961—the so-called Fulbright-Hays Act provides full authority for open Government support for U.S. representation at international, nongovernmental, educational and scientific meetings.

With this authority for funds available, why is it necessary for academic groups to accept money from the Central Intelligence Agency? One answer is that the funds appropriated are woefully inadequate. This could be remedied if

the administration would press for increased funding for support of U.S. representation at international meetings, and the Congress would meet its responsibility by providing the funds.

Until the public disclosure of the Central Intelligence Agency's activities in subsidizing student organizations, and arrangements known to both the State Department and the White House, responsible officials were seemingly content to allow this contemptible covert relationship to continue. As long as the public was unaware of these covert subsidies, it was easier to "let CIA do it" than fighting for open appropriations. The tragedy is that the "easy way" has been as corrupting to the integrity of American education as it has been unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, when turmoil over this disturbing incident over the Central Intelligence Agency's relationship to the National Students Association has died down, let us all examine our legislative consciences. Have we perhaps inadvertently contributed to the problem by failing to provide the means to fund these student organizations for travel to international conferences? I am simply suggesting breaking the relationship between the Central Intelligence Agency and the academic world is not enough. We must also see to it that alternate, and open, funds are available to ensure that U.S. academic and scientific organizations have adequate means to participate in international meetings. The legislative authority is there to provide the means. What is required is for the executive to make a vigorous case for substantially larger appropriations, and the Congress to grant the funds.

#### BALANCED VIEW URGED ON RECENT DISCLOSURES CONCERNING THE CIA

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in its lead Sunday editorial, one of the local newspapers provides the valuable service of urging a balanced view on the recent disclosures concerning the CIA. I urge my colleagues to read this editorial.

The editorial reminds us that the current flap should not be escalated to the point where we reveal all of CIA's covert operations and destroy the Nation's intelligence organization. It reminds us that the silent battle the CIA has been engaged in is not a tea party and the enemy is not a group of sorority girls. It reminds us that the CIA was the only organization that came forward to do the job that had to be done and that the job, after all, was not done too badly.

I urge my colleagues, in the strongest terms, to consider the points raised in this editorial. The editorial follows:

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO DO TO THE CIA?

It is just possible, if we all manage to work ourselves into a wild enough lather, that the current flap over the CIA can be escalated to the point where it will destroy the nation's intelligence organization. It almost seems that this is what some of the breast-beaters would like to do.

One day we have a disclosure that a student organization has been receiving covert

SUNDAY STAR 19 FEB 67

February 20, 1967

funds so that young Americans can compete with young Communists at world student meetings. Then, suddenly, nothing will do but that every traceable operation of the CIA must be laid bare to public view, commented upon in tones of pious horror, investigated, sermonized, deplored and punished, until the terrible guilt of it all has been established for all time, for all the world to see.

And what, precisely, are we guilty of? Why, of using our wits and available means to compete in a battle just as real, dirty and deadly serious as any shooting war in which we could engage.

Confronted by adversaries who threw the full power and wealth of the state into the effort to mold and control world opinion, we did not abandon the field to them. Instead, we devoted some public funds to seeing to it that Americans could confront the totalitarianism in the intellectual lists abroad, speaking their minds in representing the views of a relatively free society.

It worked, incidentally. A wide variety of Americans, most of whom never knew the source of the funds backing them, proved more than able over the years to hold their own in confrontation with disciplined, professional Communist agents. They prevented the takeover of numerous international organizations and established others which have contributed substantially to the global cause of freedom.

Consider, for example, the experience of Gloria Steinem, as interestingly reported in yesterday's Washington Post. A New York writer, Miss Steinem was director of something called "The Independent Research Service," which took CIA money to send several hundred young Americans to World Youth festivals in Vienna and Helsinki in 1959 and 1962.

Miss Steinem said she worked closely with CIA agents on the program, but that few of the students who took those trips knew that the CIA was picking up the tab.

"I never felt I was being dictated to at all," she said. "I found them (the CIA men with whom she worked) liberal and far-sighted and open to an exchange of ideas. . . . They wanted to do what we wanted to do—present a healthy, diverse view of the United States."

She was backed up by Dennis Shaul, another spokesman for the organization, who said: "We had Minnesota schoolteachers who were further right than Bill Buckley as well as members of Students for a Democratic Society. Nobody told them what to do."

Bear in mind, except for such American participation financed by CIA funds, these festivals were completely dominated by Communists, all financed and controlled by their governments. Yet, says Shaul, "The Helsinki festival was a disaster from their point of view, and I think we can take a good deal of credit for that."

Well now, why not? Is this really something that has to be apologized for? Who is corrupted by such an operation? Who would have paid the Americans' expenses if the CIA hadn't?

"The CIA," says Miss Steinem, "was the only (organization) with enough guts and foresight to see that youth and student affairs were important." And here, the lady puts her finger on an important point.

Q: Couldn't it have been done by this sort of thing could have been done without subterfuge. It is too bad that private funds were not available for these purposes. It would have been healthier, lacking such private sources, for our government to have appropriated openly the necessary monies, through the State Department, U.S. Information Agency, or some other "respectable" organization. Even though no such alternative may have been available when these programs were initiated in the early 1950s, it would have been advisable to switch them

away from CIA support as soon as that became possible.

No one, moreover, can possibly defend all the details of any one of these operations. No doubt there have been messy procedures which, when exposed, prove embarrassing. There is, one inevitably recalls, a saying about making omelettes and breaking eggs.

What is beyond comprehension in all this, however, is the monumental naivete involved in the apparent shock reaction to these disclosures on the part of otherwise knowledgeable people. After all, what have the outraged gentlemen supposed was going on all this time on the sprawling acres out at Langley? Of all the endeavors of the CIA, the effort to create outlets abroad for the expression of American opinion must surely rank as one of the milder. This is not, be it noted, a tea party that we have been engaged in. This is a viciously contested undercover war against shrewd, dedicated enemies who happen to be quite unhampered by nice-Neille scruples. The need to press this fight has all along been recognized by the top leadership of the country. The procedures that suddenly evoke such outraged reactions were not dreamed up privately by the CIA. They were directed from the top, and properly so.

The idea that an organization like the CIA can conduct its operations while restrained by a sort of daisy-chain of clergymen, den mothers and liberal politicians—such a notion is simply absurd. For our part, we hope that the present hysteria will be calmed with a rational inquiry conducted by responsible and realistic men who have some knowledge of the very serious problems involved. We are inclined to suspect that they, and the public, will end up concluding that the world has not, after all, ended—and that, in doing a job which had to be done, our intelligence organization has not done too badly.

#### CIA'S FUNDING OPERATIONS

(Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, as every James Bond fan knows, the worst sin a secret agent can commit is to "blow his cover." The recent disclosures of the Central Intelligence Agency's funding operations, coming as they do on the heels of previous exposures of heavy handedness and ineptitude, suggest that the CIA has more in common with the Keystone Cops than the well-oiled, secret operations of James Bond or "The Man From U.N.C.L.E." Indeed many of the activities of today's CIA operatives remind one more of Maxwell Smart than of James Bond. One can well imagine that the most frequently heard statement is: "Sorry about that, chief."

Mr. Speaker, in a more serious vein I should like to identify myself with the remarks made yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Fulbright.

The Senator argued that the CIA "should be restricted to the gathering of information and not be an operation activity." The Senator also said that what he found most disturbing was the covert nature of the CIA's activities in subsidizing international programs. He called for a special investigation of the CIA's funding operations and criticized the secret subsidization of books by the CIA

and the U.S. Information Agency. Senator Fulbright said:

If it is going to be, it ought to be open and above board, that this is a USIA book or this is a CIA activity. I don't think it would disturb people and in any case we should be able to make up our minds for or against that kind of activity.

And, Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times lead editorial discusses the disturbing implications of the disclosures about the CIA. As the Times says:

The health of a democratic society depends on the certainty that its free institutions—its press, its educational and scientific bodies, its publishing houses and television networks, its unions and business organizations—are truly free. That does not mean government is barred from underwriting international exchanges or research study; it means that, where such support is appropriate, it must be given openly through its own public agencies.

I include here the full text of the Times editorial:

#### SUBVERSION BY CIA

The disastrous effects of the systematic penetration of American educational, cultural and labor organizations by the Central Intelligence Agency daily become more apparent. The strength of these organizations, both in the structure of American society and in their relations with their opposite numbers in other nations, always has been their freedom from government domination.

Now, through the deviousness of CIA operations, thousands of scholars, students, unionists and professional leaders discover long after the fact that they have performed unwitting and undesired duty as secret agents.

The integrity of pro-American positions, honestly taken by groups and individuals in the worldwide battle of ideas, has been undermined. The independence of America's private foundations has been brought into question. In short, faith in American institutions has been besmirched in a way that would have eluded the reach of any foreign enemy.

It is no excuse to say that the CIA's decision to use a limitless range of philanthropic fronts to funnel its funds into youth groups, universities and other private institutions was designed to meet a very real problem of the cold war: the need for assuring that the Communists would not have an unchallenged field in the youth congresses and cultural conferences they were arranging—and subsidizing—on a global basis ten and fifteen years ago. That problem should have been met openly—by direct public subsidy.

It should have been clear long ago to the CIA's overseers in the White House that the end effect of clandestine subsidies to groups representative of the detachment and diversity of a free society must inevitably taint the genuineness of their detachment. This would be true even without the charges that have now developed of the assignment of CIA operatives to influence the policy statements and choice of officers of the National Student Association—a practice that may have extended to other organizations as well.

The health of a democratic society depends on the certainty that its free institutions—its press, its educational and scientific bodies, its publishing houses and television networks, its unions and business organizations—are truly free. That does not mean government is barred from underwriting international exchanges or research study; it means that, where such support is appropriate, it must be given openly through its own public agencies.

The worst part of the current mess is that the very nature of the C.I.A., with its mandate for espionage and subversion all over the world, rules out any thoroughgoing public inquiry into its activities. That means some residue of suspicion is sure to remain—both in this country and abroad—no matter how conscientiously the Cabinet Committee appointed last week by President Johnson seeks to formulate policies that will prevent the C.I.A. or any other Federal bureau from imperiling the "integrity and independence" of educational institutions.

When a government finds it necessary to fight subversion everywhere, the tragic danger it opens up is that among the people it subverts are its own. The defense against such weakening of America's institutional fabric must rest with the President and Congress. Even with the recent broadening of Senator Russell's watchdog committee, Congress is not doing its part of that job.

#### SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY'S ADDRESS AT CHINA CONFERENCE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a speech by Senator KENNEDY of New York, in Chicago.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the address by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, at the China Conference on February 8, 1967, at the University of Chicago, in the district I am honored and privileged to represent.

In forwarding a copy of Senator KENNEDY's remarks to me, Carl W. Larsen, director of public relations at the University of Chicago, writes:

Senator KENNEDY's speech was made at the second cumulative China Conference sponsored by the Center for Policy Study at the University. Some background information will be necessary for you and I have tried to provide this below.

The Center for Policy Study at the University of Chicago was announced in February, 1966 as a forum for the examination of major issues, both foreign and domestic, which affect the nation. The Center has thirty original fellows, chosen from among distinguished faculty members at the University. Its initial project has been a year-long study of mainland China, during which experts on various aspects of China have lectured on campus. Two cumulative China Conferences in late January and early February 1967 brought together eminent authorities on Sinology as well as United States foreign policy. It was in connection with the second of these that Senator KENNEDY spoke.

The Director of the Center for Policy Study is Charles U. Daly, Vice-President for Public Affairs at the University of Chicago. Mr. Daly, a graduate of Yale University and Columbia University, was a special assistant to the late President Kennedy, and to President Johnson, before coming to the University. From 1959 to 1960 Mr. Daly was a member of the American Political Science Association Congressional Fellowship program in the office of then-Senator John F. Kennedy and then-Representative Stewart L. Udall.

To Mr. Larsen's sketch of the background of the China Conference, to which Senator KENNEDY contributed the address, I might add that among the participants and moving spirit was Dr. Hans Morgenthau, of the University of Chicago faculty and universally recognized as among the most knowledgeable authorities in the Asian field.

Senator KENNEDY emphasized that he was not charging lack of knowledge and insistent policy as regards China to any one administration or any one political party.

Indeed—

He said—

there has been more growth in our awareness and knowledge in the past year than in the past decade.

Senator KENNEDY's address follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY AT THE CHINA CONFERENCE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

"Finality", said Disraeli, "is not the language of politics". Seldom have we been more forcefully reminded of this fact than by the recent course of Chinese history and our relations with her. And seldom have we been more in need of that reminder—as we begin, after fifteen years, the search for a new China policy.

America is beginning to rediscover China—for all the world as if it were a new, strange planet found by our astronauts. For over fifteen years China has not been a significant factor in American political or intellectual life. Once we fought her armies on the Korean battlefield; twice, in the 1950's, by the testimony of the then Secretary of State, we came to the brink of nuclear war; and for a brief moment, two offshore islands became an issue in a Presidential campaign.

But for the most part, China has been ignored. Partly this is because the main thread of the Cold War was our relationship with the Soviet Union—not only a far more powerful adversary, armed with advanced nuclear weapons, but also the acknowledged leader of the world Communist movement, and hence China's senior partner. Our energies were primarily focused on the security and reconstruction of Europe.

A second reason was the isolation of Communist China—refused admittance to the United Nations, unrecognized by us and many other countries of the world, a China, moreover, which deliberately increased its isolation by eliminating foreign influence and excluding foreigners from her territory.

Now all this has begun to change. Easing relations with the Soviet Union, the Sino-Soviet split, China's own accession to nuclear power, and the war in Viet Nam have forced our attention to the Far East—and to our relations with a nation unlike any other; in its size, its problems, its outlook on the world, and the acerbity of its relations with the United States. It is safe to say that there is no aspect of American foreign policy so important and yet uncertain—no country so seemingly menacing about which we know so little—as China.

#### EVENTS CHANGE AND WE KNOW TOO LITTLE

I do not intend to review or assess the full range of our China policy. We know too little—and events are too quickly changing what little we know. The excellent book which resulted from the first stages of this conference is already out of date in some respects—for example, it supports a statement about Chinese military doctrine by citing the views of Lo Jui-ching, who in the meantime has been purged and his death by suicide announced, perhaps indeed for the expression of those very views. Nevertheless, some salient points which can and should be made—and it is those I would discuss with you tonight.

The first—and overriding consideration—is that this is a time of unique opportunity. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, whatever else it has done, ensures that China will wish to focus her attention on internal affairs for at least the immediate future. As is apparent from her diplomacy—or lack of it—all over the world, China seems to have little present wish for contact or change in her foreign policy. For us, therefore, this is

a chance above all to think—to review the past, to analyze the present, to plan for the future course of relations between our nations. This is a chance which rarely comes to scholars or statesmen or nations in this time of constant challenge and swirling change. We could do no better than to begin that assessment now.

We might well begin with an effort to recapture history, to remind ourselves of the past roots of present problems; not to reopen old wounds; not to find in past injustice to China a present justification for Chinese injustice to others; but simply to understand, to make informed judgments in this service of policy. Memories of China have faded during these fifteen years of isolation; and perhaps our understanding was never great. China was the greatest of civilizations before the birth of Christ; yet we of the West, when we first came into extended contact with China in the 19th century, saw only a society of interior technology, whose basic premises and social structure were shaken or destroyed by those first contacts. We did not share, and probably cannot appreciate, the full agony of the century, from 1839 to 1949, which brought to this proudest of peoples only constant war and revolution, humiliation by the western powers and armed invasion by Japan; which brought to every household insecurity and death, flood and famine; which saw every Western system—militarism, republicanism, fascism, democracy—tried, for a few years or a few decades, as an organizing system to rebuild China, only to founder in corruption and inefficiency and weakness.

Out of those long years emerged the China we see today—a China suffering from all the monstrous injustices and corruptions which a Communist system inevitably imposes; a China merging the nationalism and traditions of three millennia with a Western revolutionary ideology, making great sacrifices to achieve the economic development which is the base of power; a nation to which all on its borders—from Japan around a great arc through Southeast Asia and India to the Soviet Union its closest ally—look with uneasy speculation and concern for the future.

#### SKILL AND DRIVE OF WORLD POWER

This new China has already made strides which few would have predicted when the Nationalist regime collapsed in 1949. Its rate of growth under the first five-year plan was 11 percent, until the serious setbacks of the Great Leap Forward. It demonstrated in Korea that it could at least resist Western offensives with determination. Considerably earlier than predicted, it has acquired a rudimentary nuclear capability, and is moving toward the acquisition of significant missile strength. Whatever the duration or consequences of the present internal struggle, China has shown that its people have the skill and drive which make it a potential world power.

China, however, blends strength and weakness, limitations and possibilities for the future. In examining China, it is necessary not only to know more but to have calm dispassionate public discussion.

Ever since the Korean war, the American public has heard estimates of China's aggressive potential that were often wildly exaggerated. Each new population figure (the total now seems something less than 700 million) seemed a further warning of the danger of Chinese hordes sweeping over the world, or into India, or into the fertile valleys of Southeast Asia.

However, China is, after all, a poor nation, supporting her population only through prodigies of effort and hardship. Her per person annual income of perhaps \$85 (the estimates vary from \$75 to \$90) is one of the lowest in the world, lower even than India's; her national budget of about \$17 billion is about the same as that of France,